COMMANDERS DIGEST

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE • WASHINGTON, D.C.

PROPERTY OF
PRINCETON UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

Vol. 7, No. 25 March 21, 1970

APR 8 1970

RECEIVED
DOCUMENTS DIVISION

The Defense Department Today

Secretary of Defense Melvin R. Laird has listed three Department of Defense current priorities, including the need to get support for an adequate military budget "which will provide for proper pay allowances and will do the kind of job that is needed and necessary to attract and keep men in the military services as we try to move toward a zero draft call."

Appearing on DOD's Pentagon Forum Television Program, the Secretary answered questions of a military panel of correspondents.

Moderator of the program was John C. Broger, Director, Office of Information for the Armed Forces. Correspondents were: Navy Chief Journalist Tommy Thompson, Air Force Master Sergeant Irving Lee, Marine Staff Sergeant Bob Neely and Army Master Sergeant Jerry Clark.

The Pentagon Forum is distributed to U.S. military installations overseas for showing over Armed Forces Television Stations.

Following are proceedings of the March 12 Pentagon Forum, "The Defense Department Today."

Secretary of Defense Laird

Q—Could you tell us some of your current thinking of the priorities high on your list at this time?

A—Of course, as far as the Department of Defense is concerned, the number one priority which we have to move forward on is Vietnamizing the war in Southeast Asia and in Vietnam, to turn over the combat and other responsibilities as rapidly as we can to the forces of the South Vietnamese.

The second priority, of course, is the problem that I foresee as far as the morale of our troops is concerned and upgrading the respect that the people of the United States have, in every way we can for our military services and the men that serve therein.

The third priority I would think would be in the area of the budget problems which we face with the Congress in getting support for an adequate military budget which will provide for proper pay allowances and will do the kind of job that is needed and necessary to attract and keep men in the military services as we try to move towards zero draft call.

I think that those three areas are most important as we face up to the issues before this session of Congress, and as we try to develop public support for what we are doing in the Department of Defense.

Q—I suspect somewhere in your list of priorities is the All-Volunteer Force, and I would like to ask you about the Gates Commission Report that I believe has been submitted to the President. Could you perhaps bring us up to date on that?

A—Well, that was one of my priorities that I listed; and that is moving in the direction of a zero draft call. And that's what volunteerism is all about.

And in order for us to move towards a zero draft call we must have the tools that are necessary to attract men and to keep qualified men in the four Services.

This is not just merely a question of pay. It has to do with housing. It has to do with the whole atmosphere in the United States and the manner in which people respect military service.

I would like to say it was just a pay question; and that is the primary emphasis of the Gates Commission Report, upgrading the lower brackets as far as attracting people. But it isn't just that. And I don't want to predict the date on which we will reach a zero draft call.

But we in the Department of Defense are very much in support of the objectives of the Gates Commission Report, and we hope that we can move towards that zero draft call as

(Continued On Next Page)

The Defense Department Today—Secretary Laird

(Continued From Page One)

rapidly as possible. But it is contingent upon the action of the Congress in providing the funds that are needed and necessary, not only for pay but for housing and for the many other things that are necessary for us to get down to the zero draft call.

Q—Are there any parts of the Gates Commission Report that DOD especially likes or feels would be fairly easy to implement?

A—I believe the question of the military recommendations are very easy to implement. All we need is Congressional action. And the cost of going all out on their military pay recommendations would be about $3.9 billion.

As the Secretary of Defense, I would like to say the atmosphere in Congress looked like it might move in that direction, but I am afraid that I would be going out on a limb with that kind of projection at this time.

I have already made recommendations in addition to the regular pay increase that will take place with the civilian pay increase, which is automatic. In my Defense report I have asked for a 20 per cent increase in the lower pay grades and I am hopeful that the Congress will move affirmatively on that recommendation. This would be a step in the right direction. This cost would be about $250 million, and I am hopeful that the Congress will approve that.

Sometimes pay increases are approved but the funds are not made available through appropriations to finance the pay increases, and this means that we have to take the money to finance the pay increases out of the hides of the military services either through the reduction of personnel or the cutback in services that are available for the military personnel or in the strength level of our military services. And I would hope that when pay increases are voted by the Congress, even the automatic increases which will be taking place based upon the Civil Service recommendations, that we will be successful in getting the money appropriated to pay the bill.

Q—Would you explain the Nixon Doctrine and how it relates specifically to Vietnamization?

A—Vietnamization is the first implementation of the Nixon Doctrine. The Nixon Doctrine provides that the United States will provide a nuclear shield to all of those nations to which we have treaty obligations; the four multilateral treaties plus the four bilateral treaties; and we will also provide a nuclear shield for those nations that we believe it is necessary for us to protect in our own interest.

In addition to that, we will provide military assistance so that they can make a contribution towards the ground combat support that may be needed at any future time. We will supply air and sea support. This is particularly applicable to the Vietnamization program.

When I came in as Secretary of Defense, there was no program to provide that the South Vietnamese would face up to not only the Viet Cong threat but also the North Vietnam threat. We are moving in that direction now in giving them the responsibility. The Nixon Doctrine provides for partnership in this area. It provides for strength and building the strength.

CAPTURED WEAPONS—Army Lieutenant General Julian J. Ewell, Commanding General, U.S. II Field Force in the Republic of Vietnam, discusses enemy weapons with Major Ola Lee Mize, USA, (back to camera), advisor to RVN's 3d Mobile Strike Force Command Irregulars who found them in a huge cache complex in War Zone D, 50 miles northeast of Saigon. (U.S. Army Photo by Sp4 Reimer)

It will mean an increase in military assistance in many areas of the world; but it will mean a lessened commitment as far as American ground forces are concerned, as it applies in the Asian area; and Vietnamization is that first step, the first implementation of that Nixon Doctrine.

Q—Do you feel Vietnamese forces are capable of defeating the Viet Cong and North Vietnam within a reasonable amount of time?

A—I do not believe that the North Vietnamese and Viet Cong are 12 feet tall, and I believe that the South Vietnamese, properly equipped, properly motivated, and properly supported, can and should take over this responsibility at the earliest practicable date.

Q—I don't want to get stuck up on pay here today, but you talked earlier about the All-Volunteer Force and pay as it relates to that. But how about right now? There is a pay increase underway. It was originally scheduled for July and I believe it's been rescheduled for October. Could you give the status on this, how DOD is looking at it?

A—I believe that the pay bill probably will pass the Congress. By the manner in which it's been tied up between the House and the Senate, it will probably have an effective date of July 1, the date as it passed the House. It was modified to an October date. There will be some sort of a compromise on this date. But the military pay will follow the same date as the civilian pay.

I would like to give you the exact date that would be in the bill but the House and Senate Conferees will have to meet after they have taken this action, and there will be some sort of a compromise between July 1 and perhaps January 1. It is impossible at this time to predict what that date will be, but I can assure you that the military pay increase will follow the

date that is finally agreed to as far as the civilian pay increase is concerned.

Now, the increase in the lower brackets, in the lower grades, the lower pay grades, is not tied to the civilian pay increase; and we hope that we will be able to get that legislation passed so that we can have an effective date of January 1 as the effective date of that new pay increase.

This is all dependent, however, on Congressional action. And one of the things that I have tried to do as Secretary of Defense is to stay away from making forecasts or prophecies about those dates because there are so many uncertainties as we go through the Legislative process in the Congress. But it will be a compromise, I believe, between July 1 and January 1 as far as the overall flat percentage pay increase is concerned.

Q—On this particular pay that is before the Congress right now, is it going to be a forecast of the future, or can we look back and see—we got I believe an 8.2 raise last time. Is this going to be a general forecast? Are they trying for this as it goes along?

A—What they are trying to do is estimate as best they can the necessity of the cost-of-living increases; and they are using the statistics of the Department of Labor, the Bureau of Labor Statistics, in the estimates as far as their bill is concerned, as far as civilian pay is concerned, and then what we do under the automatic provisions that are written into the Civil Service pay act, this will relate then to the military pay. The military pay rate will be a little higher than the civilian pay rate because we are dealing with a base pay structure, and in order to come out on the same basis it is necessary to have a higher percentage as far as the military is concerned.

Q—Mr. Secretary, speaking of pay brings up the matter of money and, of course, money, the budget. We are facing a budget this year that has been cut several billion dollars. What is the actual figure of the cut for this year as opposed to the 1971 budget—as opposed to the '70 budget?

A—The total budget reduction in 1971 came from a little over $80 billion to $77 billion as far as expenditures were concerned; and this budget provides for $71.8 billion; and so you are coming from a $77 billion budget down to a $71.8 billion. This is a tremendous decrease as far as the funds and resources which we have available in the Department of Defense.

In terms of gross national product over the period of the last 24 months, we have gone from the military and the Defense Department having 8.6 per cent of the gross national product assigned to them for use, to us for use, to seven per cent of the gross national product.

As far as the percentage of the overall budget, we have gone down from 41 percent of the total budget being assigned to Defense and national security activities to 35 per cent of the overall federal budget being assigned to Defense and national security activities. This is a tremendous reduction.

We just hope that we can hold this budget in the Congress because this is an austere budget we have submitted to the Congress. It's a rock-bottom, bare-bones budget; and I am testifying almost every day up there before the Committees of the Congress; and we are doing everything we can in the Department of Defense; and the Service Secretaries, the Joint Chiefs and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs are all working together to hold this budget against the onslaught of the budget-cutters that don't really realize what a tremendous

COMMANDS FIFTH AIR FORCE—Lieutenant General Gordon Graham, right, meets in Hawaii with Admiral John J. Hyland, Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet, while en route to become Commander, U.S. Forces Japan and Fifth Air Force at Fuchu Air Station, Japan. General Graham assumed command March 1.

danger we put our country in if we go too far in this budget-cutting business as far as national security is concerned.

Q—This was going to be my next question. What effect does the reduced budget have on the possibility of the Department of Defense doing its job of providing national security for the country?

A—Well, I think that we are at a level that is acceptable from the standpoint of national security in this year 1971. I think we are taking certain risks, but those risks are acceptable if we can keep the 1971 budget at the level that we have submitted it to the Congress.

But we are going to have to face some awfully difficult, tough decisions in '72 and '73 if the SALT talks don't work out successfully; and if we don't make progress there, with the tremendous buildup of the Soviet Union, the fact that the Soviet Union is spending more money than the United States is, making a much greater effort than the United States is in this whole defense area, so that we can't delay too much longer on some of these hard, tough decisions as far as the modernization of our Army, the modernization of our fleet, and many of the other very tough and difficult decisions that we must face up to here in America.

Q—Mr. Secretary, we haven't mentioned the program that I know you have high on your priority list, and I wish you could tell us a little bit about it and what the emphasis is on the Domestic Action Program.

A—I believe that every chance we have we should try to make our defense dollar do double duty; and in making the defense dollar do double duty we can help with many of the domestic problems that face America, whether it be in the area of medical services, whether it be in the area of some of the training programs we have that we are supporting this summer to attract young people, the underprivileged, in using the military to give what they can to solving some of these domestic problems that confront this country, not only in the

(Continued On Page Six)

Civilization Or Disaster?

A New Decade With Old Problems

The decade of the 1970s will be a decisive one in determining whether the nations of the world choose civilization or disaster, according to Charles W. Yost, U. S. Ambassador to the United Nations.

In this decade we face nine major problems, Ambassador Yost points out. Among them are the problems of controlling a runaway technological revolution, curbing the arms race, improving the human environment, eliminating racial conflict, and defusing the population explosion. These critical issues affect young and old alike. Following are excerpts from Mr. Yost's address at Hamilton College, Clinton, N.Y.

U.N. Ambassador Charles W. Yost

What will be relevant during the 1970s, for old and young alike? It is said of every decade, but it should be said particularly of this one, that it will be a time both of great opportunity and of great responsibility.

It is likely to be a turning point at which the future of human society for 50 years, perhaps much longer, may be determined—the moment when our generation chooses either civilization or disaster.

Secretary-General U Thant of the United Nations, a wise and compassionate man, said a few months ago:

> *"I can only conclude from the information available to me as Secretary-General that the member countries of the United Nations have perhaps 10 years left in which to subordinate their ancient quarrels and launch a global partnership to curb the arms race, to improve the human environment, to defuse the population explosion, and to supply the required momentum to world development.*
>
> *"If such a global partnership is not forged within the next decade, then I very much fear that these problems will have reached such staggering proportions that they will be beyond our capacity to control."*

A Bomb In A One-Horse Shay

For the last 30 years we have been, and still are today, in the midst of an enormous technological revolution, which is certain to go on much farther and faster, yet which we have hardly begun to assimilate. It was said recently that a graduate engineer today has a half life of 10 years—half of what he knows today will be obsolete in 10 years, and half of what he will need to know in 10 years has not yet been thought about.

The blind momentum of technological change is rather terrifying. No wonder a panel of distinguished members of the National Academy of Sciences has recommended the establishment of a federal agency to alert the United States to the perils of uncontrolled technology.

As President Nixon said recently at a conference of U. S. governors: "The central race in the world is neither an arms race nor a space race. It is the race between man and change. The central question is whether we are to be the master of events, or the pawn of events."

The trouble is not only that we push ahead with technological changes, sometimes casually, sometimes compulsively, without calculating where each change is going to take us, but even worse, that we have grossly failed to adapt our political system, our international system, the whole organization of our society, to the sum total of technological changes that are sweeping us along.

We are carrying around an atomic bomb in a one-horse shay. The sad fact is that things are still moving faster than thoughts.

What, then, will be relevant in the 1970s?

We talk about developing and modernizing the two-thirds

of the world that lags behind technologically. That is certainly important, but just as important is making our Western society fit to survive the technological advances of which we are proud.

A sociologist recently said that "the future should be viewed as the solution of the present, not the extension of it." That is very true, so long as we do not imagine there can be one grand Utopian solution for all our problems. Neither history nor human nature works that way. What there will be is an accumulating series of small progressions and retrogressions, the balance between which, 10 years hence, will determine whether our civilization is continuing to grow or has begun to wither away.

I would argue that what will be the most relevant element of the 1970s will be responsible and dedicated citizenship. It is that sort of commitment by each of us that everything depends on. No one can afford to drop out or cop out because that simply means that other people will be deciding the important things for him.

Capturing The Establishment

It is often claimed by young people that the Establishment is irrelevant. Of course, all Establishments become irrelevant with time, just as individuals do, if they are not constantly refreshed and reinvigorated by new ideas and new blood. That is what each generation has to do to the Establishment—capture it and rejuvenate it.

Specifically, what will be relevant in the 1970s? What are the problems which will have to be at least alleviated in that decade if they are not to escape our capacity to control?

First of all, peace will be relevant—much more effective means of ensuring that we do not stumble into nuclear war, much more effective ways of peacemaking and peacekeeping to eliminate smaller wars, practical, speedy ways of curbing the arms race which is not only dangerous but is wasting resources needed to cope with other problems.

Second, control of exploding populations will be relevant. World population grew from one to two billion between 1830 and 1930—a span of 100 years. It added a third billion from 1930 to 1960—a span of 30 years. The world is almost certain to add a fourth billion by 1975—a span of only 15 years. If this staggering rate should continue, we would add a fifth billion in eight more years, a sixth billion in seven years, a seventh billion in five and so on. That simply cannot be permitted to happen. We have to stop sometime and we might much better stop in the 1970s.

Third, the elimination of poverty in advanced societies like the United States will be relevant. In such societies poverty is no longer necessary and is therefore intolerable. It survives only because of carelessness and callousness. As long as it is allowed to persist, it will provoke turbulence and crime.

Fourth, the development and modernization of less-developed countries in which two-thirds of the world's people live will be relevant. This enormous task cannot be accomplished in a decade, cannot be accomplished by any simple formula, cannot be accomplished by benevolent outsiders without a much deeper involvement of the people concerned. But a more rapid progress must be achieved during the next decade by an enlightened cooperation between rich and poor nations. Otherwise there is likely to be, by the end of the decade, such a pervasive alienation and turbulence among the poor nations that the whole world community will be contaminated.

Race Should Be Irrelevant

Fifth, race will be relevant. Or rather, I should say, race should be *ir*relevant. Just as we have progressed beyond the point, or almost beyond it, where religion limits a man's rights and opportunities, so the 1970s should at last mark the time when race, in these respects, is no more relevant than religion —when diversity of races, like diversity of religions, is looked upon as a source not of arrogance and conflict but of richness and stimulation.

Sixth, cities will be relevant. Since most of us will be living in them, we will have to begin to make them habitable. We might even begin to think of making them, as we so easily could with the technical resources at our disposal, so much a source of everyday inspiration as the Greeks did of Athens 2,500 years ago or the Italians of Florence 500 years ago.

Seventh, the whole quality of the human environment will be relevant. We are all witness, even the youngest of us, to its progressive degradation by pollution, over-exploitation, ugliness, waste, private greed and public indifference. We are being criminally negligent with our inheritance and yours.

Eighth, education will be relevant . . . It will be relevant because only highly educated men and women can cope with the unpredictable new environment in which the young people of today will be living. Of course, even educated men and women will, in my judgment, be themselves relevant only if they avoid over-specialization, if they refuse to fall for that respectable form of dropping out which consists of wrapping your specialty around you like a blanket and shutting out the rest of the world.

A Global Partnership

Finally, I should say that the United Nations will be relevant in the 1970s . . . I am far from saying that the United Nations is going to become a world government during the 1970s. In the next decade, the member countries, acting in a sort of global partnership, are going to have to give the United Nations more responsibility, more authority, more resources to deal with the critical problems which I have discussed—problems common in varying degrees to all the U. N. member states but which none can cope with successfully alone.

In the seventies all of us must dedicate ourselves to bringing about that what we teach, what we learn, what we do, will be truly relevant to what is required to keep our civilization alive and healthy.

COMMANDERS DIGEST

THIS PUBLICATION CONTAINS OFFICIAL INFORMATION, NEWS AND POLICY, DIRECT FROM WASHINGTON AUTHORIZED SOURCES.

Published weekly by American Forces Press Service, 1117 N. 19th St., Arlington, Va. 22209, a unified activity of the Office of Information for the Armed Forces, OASD (M&RA). Reproduction of content is authorized. Suggested dateline for materials used is WASHINGTON (AFPS).

The Defense Department Today—Secretary Laird

(Continued From Page Three)

field of welfare, in education, but also in the field of medical attention.

We have learned a lot in Vietnam in a medical way. The kind of medical treatment that has been made available in Vietnam has really taught us much. But we haven't applied many of those lessons right here in the United States, and I think it's the responsibility of all of us in the military and in the military services and the Department of Defense to do what we can to help solve some of these critical domestic problems in the field of health, education, and welfare.

Our primary responsibility is national security. But there can be these side benefits that we should cooperate with, whether it is a base in Alabama or a base in Illinois, whether it be in the east or the west or the north or the south. Military personnel should try to make this extra added contribution that I am sure they will make and are making.

Q—Are we doing this at an increase in the Defense Budget, or are we doing it within resources?

A—We must do it within resources, of course. And our primary responsibility is providing for the national security and the safety of the people of the United States. But when these dollars that we are expending can do double duty, we should see that they do double duty in all of these various programs that are available.

Q—I presume this means if we have idle facilities or idle equipment and it can be used for other purposes, we are then encouraging that that be done?

A—We are doing everything we can to encourage it, and we have had tremendous progress. This summer, out of every hundred jobs that are available as far as the military is concerned, we will be taking on 4½ for each 100 underprivileged young people to give them an opportunity to become acquainted with the military; but also to give them the benefits that the military can give them in the way of education, in the way of training, and in the way of work opportunities, and I think that this is most important.

Q—I wonder if perhaps you could clear something up here. On that selective pay raise for the lower grades you mentioned earlier, you said January 1. Was that 1970 or 1971 for an effective date?

A—It has not been decided. One of the bills provides for a January 1971 date; the other one a July 1, 1970 date.

Q—These selective pay raises, or special pay, seem to fall into the area of, well, things like the VRB, Variable Reenlistment Bonus, pro pay, money for submarine officers; I think they can get up to $15,000. Is this going to be the main tool for retention in the future, the special pays?

A—I think there will have to be some consideration given to that. It is very difficult to get into a program that ties you down to special pay status, and I wish we could keep away from that as best we can.

We have had to make some changes. We have made some recommendations as far as attorneys are concerned. We could have changes that were passed in this last session of Congress that are dealing with some of our submarine officers and special areas where we have a difficult time. I would hope that we wouldn't have to do too much of that. But we are looking into it, as you know, and I hope we don't have to go in that direction too far.

Q—You have said we must recognize the new forces at work and we must be able to help shape a changing world. What are these new forces? How is the world changing? We still have conflicts between nations.

A—I think we undoubtedly will have conflicts from time to time, and I don't mean to be an optimist or a pessimist. I try to be a realist.

I do think we have opportunities as we move from this period we have gone through in the last 20 years of confrontation to move into this era of negotiation that the President has talked about, whether it be in the SALT talks or the discussions that are going on in Paris.

We haven't had too much success in Paris as far as the negotiations there. But I don't believe we want to back away from these talks and these exchanges.

I don't know what the Soviet Union is up to. I cannot tell myself whether the tremendous buildup, the fact that they went ahead with the SS–9, the SS–11, they have increased their Polaris submarine construction program to a much greater extent than I had predicted when I appeared before the Congress last year, and I was accused of overstating the threat. As it turns out, I understated the threat last year; and I think that is pretty well accepted now.

But I do not believe that we want to back away from negotiations. We want to continue to carry on the SALT talks. We hope that we can meet with some success there. But we should not be in a position where we unilaterally take action during this period to weaken the United States of America, and that is why I am against unilateral actions prior to the time we meet with success in SALT or in any other negotiations.

That is why I think it is important for us in the Department of Defense to be in as strong a position as we possibly can as we enter this era of negotiations.

Q—What if the North Vietnamese delegation decides to return to Hanoi and break off the Paris talks?

A—I think that this certainly would be a mistake; but our program in Vietnam is not based entirely on negotiations. Negotiations complement the Vietnamization program.

Prior to this time our program in Vietnam was based upon success in negotiations. Up until March of a year ago our whole program was based on negotiating the North Vietnamese out of South Vietnam, out of Cambodia, and out of Laos. Now our program is based upon preparing the South Vietnamese to face the North Vietnamese threat as well as the VC threat.

If we have success in negotiations, it will merely complement and hasten the Vietnamization program. But we are not putting all of our eggs in the negotiation basket under the program that we have finalized during the last year.

Q—If we could turn to another area, last year your Department developed a Human Goals program. Why do you have it, or why do we have it in the Department of Defense? What is

GENERALS MEET—Army Major General George S. Beatty (right) is met at the Parris Island Recruiting School, S.C., by Marine Corps Major General O. F. Peatross, Parris Island Depot Commanding General. General Beatty and his staff attended a presentation of Marine Amphibious Warfare. General Beatty is the Commanding General of the Hunter Stewart Army-Air Force Complex, Savannah, Ga.

the necessity of it; and what prompted you to devise the Human Goals program?

A—The most important asset that we have in the Department of Defense or that you have in the Marine Corps or in the Navy, the Army or the Air Force, is people; and people are the most important thing that we have in the Department of Defense.

Not only are they important to run our airplanes, our ships and all of the other sophisticated equipment that we have, they are important in many other ways because without these people we cannot be successful in any pursuit.

Not only do they take up 55 per cent of the total Defense Budget in paying salaries and wages and benefits and housing and family allowances; people are the most important thing in our Department.

And I was, as Secretary of Defense, trying to do what I could to put a greater emphasis on the importance of these people in our Department.

We have started a new management system. We like to refer to it as participatory management, to get the military and the civilian leadership in the Department to participate in the decision-making process. And I think that we are on the right track here. People are important, and that is why our Human Goals program has been given such an emphasis since I have been in this job.

I happen to be a politician. I was in the Congress for nine terms, and I know how important people are because I have been dealing with people as a Representative of the people for the last 18 years.

Q—This program of Human Goals has received the widest possible dissemination. Have you received any feedback on this, how it affects them, and how you think it is working overall?

A—We have had a very fine acceptance of this all over the world, in all of our military bases, and I have been very pleased with the importance that our commanders are putting in the Human Goals program. And I think there is a recognition now, a better recognition, of how important people are.

Now we have got to be able to get the people of this country to realize how important it is to choose a military career and how important the military is to their future security, their future safety, and to what they may want to do in developing this great country of ours.

(Freedom Foundation has made an award to Secretary Laird for the Human Goals program.)

Well, the awards and citations that we have received in the Department of Defense on this program I think has been most remarkable; and it is an important program.

Q—While we are on the subject of Human Goals, what about race relations within the military? Are they improving?

A—I would like to say they are improving, but we have problems. We have difficult problems as far as race relations are concerned.

I believe that in the military services a better job has been done in recognizing individuals on their individual merit basis than almost in any other area of our society, and greater progress has been made in the military, I believe, than in other segments of our society.

But by that statement I don't want to imply that we haven't got some very difficult problems facing us as far as the military services are concerned. There is a new awareness on the part of whites and blacks about the kind of pride that they have in their race, in their color; and this has caused some problems; but they are not great problems. They are problems that we can solve. They are problems we must work on; and they are problems that we must be aware of.

But I believe the military is trying to do a good job; but they have to do a better job.

Q—Well, the question I have is probably not going to give you much time then. I was going to bring in the fact that in a recent statement regarding the 1971 budget, you said that as we reduce our defense spending and move farther into negotiations, that the Soviet Union was not making similar reductions but were in fact pulling abreast of us in some areas and ahead of us in others.

How do you equate this with the fact that we are cutting our budget and allowing the Russians to pull abreast of us in some areas and ahead of us in others?

A—That is why I said earlier in the program the important years would be '72, '73 and '74. We are still maintaining the strength that we need during this period, but the Soviet Union, as they move forward, and if they continue this program, our decision is going to be a difficult one. We will have to devote greater resources as far as our military spending is concerned in the future. We do have this problem.

Earlier in the program I pointed out the difficulties that we do face as far as the Soviet's strategic buildup, as far as the Viet Cong buildup, and the fact their budget is going up and our budget is going down.

I know and I hope that the Congress will support the budget that we have submitted for this Fiscal Year 1971 because, let me say again, it is an austere budget. It is a rock-bottom, barebones budget for the Department of Defense. And I hope that the budget-cutters will not go too far on this budget. It would be dangerous to the security of this country.

10 States To Hold Primaries In May

Ten states will hold primary elections in May to select party candidates for the general elections Nov. 3.

Primaries in North Carolina and Texas will be May 2; in Alabama, Indiana and Ohio May 5; in Nebraska and West Virginia May 12; in Pennsylvania May 19, and in Kentucky and Oregon May 26.

Eligible voters from these states should apply for absentee ballots well before the primary dates to allow sufficient time for mail delivery of applications, receiving absentee ballots and voting instructions, and returning voted ballots to election officials. They may use Federal Post Card Applications (FPCA).

Kentucky requires absentee ballot applications to be postmarked not later than 20 days before the primary. Pennsylvania voters must apply in time to be able to return voted ballots to election officials by the Friday before the primary.

Alabama and Ohio permit only members of the Armed Forces and their spouses to apply for absentee ballots by FPCA. North Carolina extends the use of the FPCA to members of the Merchant Marine except those on inland waterways and the Great Lakes, in addition to members of the Armed Forces and their spouses.

Texas authorizes FPCA application for absentee ballots for members of the Armed Forces and Merchant Marine, their spouses and dependents, and all citizens abroad.

Indiana limits use of the FPCA to apply for absentee ballots to members of the Armed Forces and the Merchant Marine, U.S. civilian employes outside the state, and their spouses and dependents.

Kentucky, Nebraska and Pennsylvania specify those authorized to apply for absentee ballots by FPCA as: members of the Armed Forces, members of the Merchant Marine (Pennsylvania—not serving on the Great Lakes or inland waterways), U.S. civilian employes overseas, members of religious groups or welfare agencies attached to the Armed Forces, and their spouses and dependents.

Suggestions Save $263 Million In FY 1969

Individual suggestions from civilian employes and military personnel saved the government $263 million in Fiscal Year 1969.

The suggestions, submitted in response to the Defense Department's Incentive Awards Program, ran the gamut from one-time ideas producing intangible benefits to recurring savings of many thousands of dollars. David H. Green, overseer of the program, said the average savings per adopted suggestion was in excess of $2,400.

Mr. Green explained that reported savings were necessarily deflated because overall figures represent only first-year savings. "A suggestion may be turned in officially under the program before it is adopted," he said, "or it may follow its adoption." In either case, its value to the government is based on first-year savings, even though the suggestion may continue to realize savings indefinitely.

He said the principal objectives of the awards program are "to motivate civilian and military personnel of the Department of Defense to think along the lines of increased efficiency and improvement of operations and to reward them appropriately when they do come up with real contributions to increased economy and efficiency."

The degree to which the program is achieving its objectives is attested to by increased participation and higher quality suggestions — that is, suggestions which result in higher dollar savings.

Fiscal Year 1969 participation was 25 per cent higher than in 1968.

Changes effected in the over-all program by the Civil Service Commission promise to enhance the quality of suggestions still further in FY 1970, according to Mr. Green. The minimum amount of tangible benefits recognized under the revised program is $250—with a minimum award of $25. He pointed out that the new program demands a 10-1 ratio of benefits to awards.

The new policies and standards—as they apply to the Department of Defense—are outlined in a directive issued June 20, 1969 (Instruction 5120.16).

In FY 1969, Mr. Green said, individuals were rewarded for their ideas with $4.9 million in cash awards and with several kinds of honorary awards.

He emphasized that the suggestion program is open to both military and civilian personnel.

NEW CHAIRMAN—Army Chaplain (Major General) Francis L. Sampson, Chief of Army Chaplains (center) recently assumed Chairmanship of Armed Forces Chaplains Board, succeeding Chaplain (Rear Admiral) James W. Kelly, CHC, Chief of Navy Chaplains (third from left). Board membership includes, left to right, Chaplain (Colonel) Hans E. Sandrock, USAF, Executive Director; Chaplain (Colonel) Roy M. Terry, USAF, Deputy Chief of Air Force Chaplains (brigadier general selectee); Chaplain Kelly; Chaplain Sampson; Chaplain (Major General) Edwin R. Chess, USAF, Chief of Air Force Chaplains; Chaplain (Brigadier General) Gerhardt W. Hyatt, USA, Deputy Chief of Army Chaplains; Chaplain (Captain) Vincent Lonergan, CHC, USN, Director of Chaplains Division, Office, Chief of Navy Chaplains.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402.
Price 5 cents (single copy). Subscription Price: $2.50 per year; $3.25 additional for foreign mailing.
☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE: 1969 393/220/S-57